Claim 12 has been canceled. The limitations of Claim 12 have been included in Claim 1. The amendment of Claim 1 is further supported at pages 27-31 of the specification, for example the formulae (XIII) and (XIV) in which Y... does not contain a carbonyl group directly connected to a carbon atom of the terminal olefinic group and directly connected to the oxygen adjacent to the residue Y.

Claims 28-31 have been added.

New Claim 28 is supported by the paragraph bridging pages 30 and 31 of the specification as originally filed.

New Claim 29 is supported by Claim 25 as originally filed.

New Claims 30 and 31 are supported at page 31, lines 18-29 of the specification as originally filed.

No new matter is believed to have been added by entry of this amendment. Entry and favorable reconsideration are respectfully requested.

Upon entry of this amendment Claims 1-11 and 13-31 will now be active in this application.

Reply to Office Action of: December 6, 2007

REMARKS

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Reddy for the helpful and courteous discussion with Applicants' Representative on November 30, 2007. It was noted that Smith et al do not disclose or suggest an asymmetrical compound as claimed in amended Claim 1. The compound V of Smith et al requires a carbonyl group on each side of the molecule and is there fore symmetrical.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application, as amended, in view of the following remarks.

The rejection of Claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over <u>Smith et al</u> in view of <u>Maruyama et al</u> and the rejection of Claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over <u>Smith et al</u> in view of <u>Maruyama et al</u> and <u>Momoda et al</u> are respectfully traversed.

The present invention as set forth in **amended Claim 1** relates to a mixture for the production of transparent plastics, comprising:

a) a prepolymer, produced from compounds of the formula (I) and (II)

$$\begin{array}{c}
R^1 \\
S \\
R^2 \\
\end{array}$$
(1)

$$\begin{array}{c|c}
R^{1} & R^{2} & R^{1} \\
\hline
S & R^{2} & S \\
\hline
O & M
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c|c}
R^{1} & S \\
\hline
O & N
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c|c}
R^{1} & S \\
\hline
O & N
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c|c}
R^{1} & S \\
\hline
O & N
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c|c}
R^{1} & S \\
\hline
O & N
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c|c}
R^{1} & S \\
\hline
O & N
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c|c}
R^{1} & S \\
\hline
O & N
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c|c}
R^{1} & S \\
\hline
O & N
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c|c}
R^{1} & S \\
\hline
O & N
\end{array}$$

wherein R1 each independently of one another mean hydrogen or a methyl residue,

 R^2 each independently of one another mean a linear or branched, aliphatic or cycloaliphatic residue or a substituted or unsubstituted aromatic or heteroaromatic residue and m and n each independently of one another mean a whole number greater than 0 with m + n > 0, and alkylthiols or polythiols,

Reply to Office Action of: December 6, 2007

HS-R³-SH (III)

wherein R³ can similarly or differently from R² have the meaning stated in R², and

- b) at least one radical polymerizable monomer (A) with at least two methyl acrylate groups; and
 - c) aromatic vinyl compounds,
- d) optionally, a radical polymerizable monomer with at least two terminal olefinic groups, which differ in reactivity,
 - e) optionally, at least one ethylenically unsaturated monomer (B);
 - f) or optionally, a mixture of d) and e); and
- g) an <u>asymmetric</u> crosslinker which is a radical polymerizable monomer with at least two terminal olefinic groups which differ in reactivity, of the general formula

$$\begin{array}{c}
Y \\
R^{19}
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
R^{18} \\
R^{19}
\end{array}$$
wherein

the residue R¹⁹ independently means a hydrogen atom, a fluorine atom and/or a methyl group,

the residue R¹⁸ is a linking group which contains 1 to 1000 carbon atoms, and the residue Y is a linkage or a linking group with 0 to 1000 carbon atoms and does not contain a carbonyl group directly connected to a carbon atom of the terminal olefinic group and directly connected to the oxygen adjacent to the residue Y in formula (XII).

New Claims 28-31 have been added to further define the compound of formula (XII).

Smith et al, Maruyama et al and Momoda et al, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest a mixture as claimed in amended Claim 1 and in new Claims 28-31,

Reply to Office Action of: December 6, 2007

especially a mixture having components a), b), c) and g) as claimed, in particular a), b)
c) combined with a g) that is an asymmetric crosslinker which is a radical polymerizable
monomer with at least two terminal olefinic groups which differ in reactivity, of the general
formula

$$\begin{array}{c}
Y \\
Q \\
R^{19}
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
R^{18} \\
R^{19}
\end{array}$$
wherein

the residue R¹⁹ independently means a hydrogen atom, a fluorine atom and/or a methyl group,

the residue R¹⁸ is a linking group which contains 1 to 1000 carbon atoms, and the residue Y is a linkage or a linking group with 0 to 1000 carbon atoms and does not contain a carbonyl group directly connected to a carbon atom of the terminal olefinic group and directly connected to the oxygen adjacent to the residue Y in formula (XII).

Smith et al, Maruyama et al and Momoda et al, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest a mixture as claimed having formulae (XIII) and (XIV).

The formula V at col. 8 of <u>Smith et al</u> is <u>symmetric</u> in that it contains carboxyl groups connected to the carbon atom of the terminal double bonds. However, the compounds of formula (XII) are <u>asymmetric</u>.

Maruyama et al and Momoda et al do not cure the defects of Smith et al.

Therefore, rejection of Claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over <u>Smith et al</u> in view of <u>Maruyama et al</u> and the rejection of Claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over <u>Smith et al</u> in view of <u>Maruyama et al</u> and <u>Momoda et al</u> are believed to be unsustainable as the present

Reply to Office Action of: December 6, 2007

invention is neither anticipated nor obvious and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully

requested.

The objection to Claims 13 and 15 is obviated by the amendment of the claims.

The rejection of Claims 25 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph, is obviated

by the amendment of the claims.

The rejection of Claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 101, is obviated by the amendment of the

claims.

Regarding the provisional double patenting rejections, the MPEP instructs the

Examiner to withdraw the provisional rejection if it is the only issue remaining in one case

and convert the provisional rejection in the other application to a double patenting rejection.

MPEP 822.01. Thus, the provisional double-patenting rejections should be withdrawn.

13

Reply to Office Action of: December 6, 2007

This application presents allowable subject matter, and the Examiner is kindly requested to pass it to issue. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the claims or otherwise wish to discuss this case, he is kindly invited to contact Applicants' below-signed representative, who would be happy to provide any assistance deemed necessary in speeding this application to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Kirsten A. Grueneberg, Ph.D. Registration No.: 47,297

Norman F. Oblon

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413 -2220

NFO:KAG: (OSMMN 08/07)